

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE

Appr'v @ FS mtg. 12/06/05

<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Minutes of the Senate Meeting of November 22, 2005

HIGHLIGHTS

Proposed UT/MUO Merger
University Budget
Consideration of University Prioritization Plan and Timeline

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

Chair Jorgensen called the meeting to order. **Senator Steve Martin, Executive Secretary**, called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2005-2006 Senators

Present: Barden, Barnes, Barrett, Bischoff, Bopp, Bowyer, Bresnahan, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (Sullivan), Floyd, Fournier, Fridman, Hoover, Hudson, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kennedy, King, Komuniecki, Kunnathur, Lambert, Lipman, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Martin, Mesbuh, Morrissey, Niamat, Olson, Piazza, Poling, Pope, N Reid, Schultz, Sherman, Skeens, Sponberg, Stoudt, Suter, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wilson, Wolff (41)

Excused: Barlowe, Hottell, Ritchie, (3)

Unexcused: Kozlowski, (1)

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes–Minutes of the November 08, 2005 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report by Chair, Andy Jorgensen: I have a very brief Executive Committee report today since we have a very full agenda today.

- **Meeting with President Johnson.** Last Thursday, Nov. 17, the FS Exec Committee met with President Johnson and discussed several topics including the UT/MUO merger. This is on the agenda as a topic later in today's meeting. Also discussed was the impact of the University retirement plan.
- **Future Events.** I would like to call your attention to a couple of events that are upcoming. All faculty members should have received a flyer containing the information on the Faculty Open Forums on the Admissions Criteria. The bottom of the flyer refers you to a web page where you can review background documents relating to the questions that will be discussed at the forum. This forum is an opportunity for faculty to speak their mind on this subject. The forum will be held in this room, SU 2582, on the morning of Dec. 2, from 10:30-12 pm

and on the afternoon of Dec. 6. The afternoon session will follow a brief Faculty Senate meeting.

At this time I would like to introduce our President, Dr. Dan Johnson, to speak on one of our agenda items, the UT/ MUO merger.

UT President Daniel M. Johnson: Thank you very much, Andy. I appreciate this opportunity to speak to the Senate and would like to acknowledge the presence of Mr. James M. Tuschman, a member of the Ohio Board of Regents and a former Chairman of the University of Toledo Board of Trustees. In the brief time I have this afternoon, I would like to focus on my remarks on the discussions that are underway regarding the possible merger of the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio. With a brief history from a personal point of view, prior to my going to Alaska as Provost, I was a dean at the University of North Texas (North Texas). During my tenure at North Texas as dean, I was part of an effort that resulted in bringing the Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine, a stand alone medical school, into the Univ. of North Texas. I served on the coordinating Board during that transition and ultimately was appointed to the Department of Family Practice. I have been very much a part of, and participated in, the type of initiative we have under discussion here. Prior to going to the Univ. of North Texas, I was a Professor at Virginia Commonwealth University. At that time The Medical College of Virginia had just merged as a free, stand-alone medical school, with Virginia Commonwealth University. I worked over twelve years closely with the health center faculty and staff at that institution, and know first hand what is involved with such mergers.

When I was a candidate here at the University of Toledo for my position, it was very apparent to me that we had a wonderful free-standing medical school right here in Toledo, known then as The Medical College of Ohio (MUO), but it was a separate institution. From a public policy perspective I thought this was unfortunate, so during my very first discussions with Dr. Frank McCullough, MUO's President at the time, relationships between the Medical University and UT were discussed. We were both interested in strengthening the level of collaboration between our two institutions. After Dr. McCullough stepped down, Dr. Ahmera Gaharra became the interim president at MUO and we began discussions about strengthening the relationship between our two institutions again. These discussions included the advantages and disadvantages of possibly merging the two institutions. Information and letters were exchanged talking quite openly about the possibility of a merger, but felt the timing was not right and should be deferred until a permanent president was on board at MUO.

Shortly after Dr. Lloyd Jacobs was appointed MUO President, we began talking about ways in which we could configure our two institutions in a way that would produce greater productivity, greater disabilities, be more attractive and have a greater return on the investment that is being made by the state and the students at these institutions. After continuing that conversation for the last year, this spring we began to seriously discuss options for achieving greatness. These options would also increase the visibility of the two institutions, increase and improve the reputation, increase productivity, strengthen our research, eliminate some duplication, and increase shared services. During those conversations, merger was just one of several options we discussed without focusing on any one particular option at that time. We knew that we had to find the type of

relationship that would give us the greatest return, visibility, and recognition that we could achieve with the resources we had. We have increased our collaboration, the number of partnerships, shared services, and we have joint academic programs in public health and nursing, just to name a few. Most recently we have shared services in the Joint Office of Government Relations, and the Office of Collaborative Research, which has had a tremendous effect on linking our research efforts between three universities but collaboration can only take you so far. Only by merging the two institutions, in my opinion, will give the state, our community and our constituents the full benefit of our respective assets.

During conversations between Dr. Jacobs and me, we discussed a suggestion that I had made to Dr. Gaharra to commission a study to take a good, hard look at a merger possibility as a joint venture. Dr. Jacobs felt the Medical University of Ohio would prefer to do the study on their own and they moved ahead with a study conducted by Ryan Beck & Co. This is a public document that was released in September, and lists several potentials we have here with a serious consideration of a merger. I would like to relay the results of their analysis.

Results of Analysis

As a result of our (Ryan Beck & CO.) analysis, we believe that the proposed combination between MUO and UT would be beneficial for both institutions as well as for the State of Ohio and for the community of Toledo. The key benefits to this combination are listed below.

- Improved Political Positioning
- Better Branding and Public Perception
- Improved School Rankings/Prestige
- Enhanced Research Funding Potential
- Improved Faculty Recruitment and Retention
- Improved Student Recruitment
- Enhanced Fundraising Capability
- Increased State Appropriations
- Improved Financial Performance
- Potential Upgrade in Credit Rating
- More Flexibility for Capital Projects
- Increased Access to Capital
- Enhanced Image of Toledo Community
- Synergies and Savings Due to Elimination of Duplicative Costs and Programs
- Enhanced Course Offerings and new Programs
- Greater Ability to Form Public/Private Partnerships

Upon reading this analysis, I felt this was really a new ball game. The recommendations of this neutral, third party analysis had little or no down side to this merger. It is very difficult for me to not be enthusiastic about the long term benefits to UT and MUO if we were able to secure legislative support for this merger. I am very enthusiastic about what this could mean for our students, faculty, city of Toledo, Northwest Ohio and our state. In my opinion, this is a win-win proposition.

This initiative however, will not be without operational and logistical challenges. There will be problems attached to the merger; that can not be avoided, but we need to

remember we are reversing a decision that was made 40 years ago to keep UT and MUO separate. The two institutions have been allowed to go their separate ways for four decades so naturally there will be issues, challenges and some difficult problem to address if the merger goes forward. There may be speculation as to how things will be divided and what might happen to various colleges and programs. I don't have those answers yet. This will take years, maybe 3-5 years or longer, to move through a full transition. Yes, there are some obvious synergies between our health related programs. Does that mean that the College of Pharmacy or Health and Human Services would move to the MUO campus; that is a possibility, but again, we don't have those answers yet? So, you will need to look at how you create the strongest return, the greatest synergy and how it relates to the physical location of the programs.

Our approach to this is simple, we need to make a decision now and resolve the problem as they come. If we wait and try to solve all of the potential problems or address all of the questions you and others might want answered before going forward with the merger, it will never happen. This is ultimately a decision for the legislature. It is not my decision, Dr. Jacobs, OBOR, or even our Boards decisions. Our job is to work with the legislatures to do what is needed to help determine what is in the state's best interest, and what is good for the region, community, our students and our public institutions. Some of you may be wondering where we go from here and what opportunities there are for your input. I emphasize, this effort will be decided by the legislature with input from our Boards and our Regents. However, you can influence those decisions by endorsing, or rejecting, a resolution from your Executive Committee that I understand will be put on the floor today. This is your opportunity and a way that we can move forward with a faculty perspective included. Even though I am committed to shared governance, this is a situation where we can not answer all of the unknowns before commitment. We must focus on the big picture and the long term benefits for the two universities if this merger takes place. This is the most important issue, in my opinion, and a move that will truly position The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio for greatness. That is the only objective here. We should not back away from this opportunity because of any problems we may foresee during this transitions or this opportunity may never present itself again.

This University has been through some difficult times in our history, and we are better today that we have ever been in terms of productivity, collaboration, diversity and engagement with Toledo and northwest Ohio. We are having an enormous impact on our region's economy and we will increase our role in advancing higher education here, as well as working on advancing the economy in northwest Ohio and Toledo. The decision on the matter of merger, in my opinion needs to be made quickly. Our Boards needs to resolve the question, one way or the other, within the next few weeks so we can continue on with the process. I have talked to approximately 200 people and have heard no significant resistance to the proposed merger. Community leader throughout the city and northwestern Ohio are applauding this merger.

We can expect some added one-time costs to help us deal with the changes that may occur in this transition. In my opinion I believe that 2% or 3% of our combined budget will be needed and should come from the legislature if they approve this action. My view is that if we are going to do this, let us do it right; this will be the most cost effective approach. The worst thing the legislature could do is approve this merger and

not provide the resources to make it happen right. There will be significant future efficiencies and savings that can be reallocated to strengthen our university, but that is not the rationale for the merger. It is a move to greatness and the greater national visibility that we receive, the greater the potential for research, attracting talent, and changing and diversifying our regional economy. The rationale for the state is to receive a greater return on its investment. My purpose in coming before you today is to ask for your support as a Faculty Senate representing the faculty interest at this institution, for a merger between the Medical University of Ohio, a fine university and medical school, and The University of Toledo. A resolution, or statement, from the Faculty Senate would be very helpful to our Boards, Regents and legislature, by letting them know where you stand as a faculty on this issue.

Finally, a word about another important issue that is on your agenda today and that is prioritization and how that fits into this bigger picture. Now, more than ever, we need a strong sense of inter-priorities. We absolutely need this today, now, to move forward. I strongly encourage the University Prioritization Committee (UPC) to continue your efforts; this must be done. I am encouraged by the progress in adapting prioritization toward a Baldrige-type process. I commend the UPC and its leadership for moving in this direction. I would like to address any quick questions you may have but first would like to ask Mr. Tuschman if he has any comments from a Regents perspective.

Chair Jorgensen: The President will take a few questions then as you see on our agenda under New Business, we have a resolution to consider and will discuss the merger in greater detail at that time.

Questions/Comments

Senator Bowyer: Many universities have either spun off or sold their hospitals because of liability issues. You only have to look at the number of lawsuits, Medicare and Medicaid problems that come with running a hospital to see why. There has been some discussion in the past about MUO selling off their hospital but it did not occur. Has ownership of the hospital been part of your discussions?

Dr. Johnson: Yes, we have discussed it and it is a very important part of the equation. Again, we talk about having a clear sense of direction on what is happening when making a decision. There are a number of different perspectives on this issue. Let me assure you that any work between MUO and UT involving the hospital, would be done in such a way that with the financial variations that can occur in a hospital setting, it will not have an adverse impact on the fiscal strength of this campus and our programs. That is a principle generally agreed to by all those who have been in the sessions, and will be a question I am sure, our Board, and others will have as this moves forward.

Senator Komuniecki: I believe that there may be a lot of enthusiasm for this proposal around the room, but the biggest concern I have is the timing issue. Senators are being faced with a resolution and they have had no chance for discussion at length about something that could be affecting the lives of everyone at this institution for the foreseeable future. I was thinking about the time on this campus when we created a new college. It took an entire year to make that new college yet, we are being asked in one afternoon to make decisions where there are still so many unanswered questions. Although there may be enthusiasm for the concept, I think the “devil is always in the details”, Maybe some concerns that could be allayed if we had more information.

Dr. Johnson: I think all of us feel that way. The number of questions that I could address, just in this room, would take us weeks if not months, to answer. There will be due diligence done on this obviously. When we first started talking about this merger, we quickly came to the conclusion that if we try to answer all of the questions, even the major questions in advance, it would never move forward. We are capable of dealing with the problems and questions effectively as they come up, we believe we can handle that. There are 125 universities around the nation with medical schools. We are just as bright and capable of dealing with the challenges as they are on their campuses. We all have a lot of questions about this, but we need to keep our focus on the objective and not be sidetracked by important issues; issues not sufficient in-and-of-themselves that say that we should not do this.

The long term benefits for this city, region and the state, not to mention our institutions, is so significant that in my view, would be a real lost opportunity if we do not move forward on this merger. Timing is an issue. We need to move quickly because the longer this stretches out, the probability increases that this opportunity will be lost.

Senator Barden: Members of our Law School are not part of our collective bargaining. Would they have to become part of a union? Is there a union at MUO? Have you discussed this?

Dr. Johnson: There are two unions at MUO, but no faculty union. We have discussed the collective bargaining issue, but I would not want to misspeak on that and I do not have the information in front of me here.

Senator Barrett: Given that the study was undertaken by MUO, not jointly, have we planning any study of our own? What basis or grounds do you have to be comfortable that this study represents our interests as fully or richly as they need to be developed to this point?

Dr. Johnson: Having been a part of this at two other institutions, and looking at the analysis that was conducted on this study, I am convinced their findings do represent valid findings that apply to our interest as well. We will ask the questions that we will and need to address, that is the university's view going into this.

It is preliminary in the sense that there are a lot of different areas were we will want to build in a better understanding and analysis as we move forward with this. Based on my experience, the scope and methodology used in this analysis I feel it adequately reflects the interest that we have, and questions that we would have satisfactorily.

Regent James M. Tuschman: Before we leave let me say it is a pleasure to be with you today. On behalf of the Board of Regents I would like to make one or two comments. First of all, I could not be prouder, and I hope you are also, of our President. When Dr. Johnson was brought aboard, he was given many, many challenges. One of them included making sure that our neighboring universities and sister institutions grew closer and closer to this institution, and that we were able to reach out to those institutions as well. He has done that. He has done an outstanding job in collaborating with Dr. Jacobs at the Medical University of Ohio. Having been on this Board for nine years, chair for two, we looked at these opportunities throughout the course of my trusteeship here. I am sure trustees prior to my being on the Board looked at these initiatives. What made the difference was the ability of Dr. Johnson and Dr. Jacobs to collaborate, talk and move that initiative forward the likes of which we have never seen before.

I must tell you that the times are different now, as you all know. We are facing issues at the state level that will imperil institutions unless we begin to look strategically at combinations, university systems, reduction of duplication, and efficiencies. We are challenged more than we ever have been. I would love to tell you the state of Ohio can shower us with more dollars. I am here to tell you that probably is not going to happen. We have to find ways to work smarter, and to work harder with the money that we have. This initiative will, in my opinion, spur other institutions to look strategically at their relationships with their neighbors and other institutions that are nearby them to find ways in which can deliver high quality education in the most cost effective way.

All of the answers are not here. They would not be here if this merger was studied for another two or three years but we must move forward. You men and women are a very resourceful, powerful and capable group. I have had the privilege of working with many of you for years. With your help, wisdom, insight and support, we can get this done while leading this state into some new thinking and new ideas. Dr. Johnson and Dr. Jacobs deserve tremendous credit for their foresight and courage for what they are doing. I am here asking for your help, I hope you give it to us.

IV. Reports: Chair Jorgensen: The next item on the agenda is the University budget by Exec. VP and Chief Operating Officer Bill Decatur and Assoc. VP for Finance and Planning, Dawn Rhodes

Mr. William Decatur, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer: Thank you. This afternoon I would like to present to you the budget deliberations that have been going on in the Fiscal Advisory Committee (FAC) since the beginning of this semester. I will outline the problems we are facing, the source of those problems, the recommendations from the FAC to the President and the President's decisions to balance the budget this year. We will then be looking forward to fiscal year 2007, which is still under deliberations in FAC and will be in several months.

This is the current situation for fiscal year 2006. The original budget was balanced, and then revised for a shortfall of ten million plus dollars, with the majority of that shortfall in under-attainment of revenue and small amount due to some expenditure issues.

<u>Current Situation</u>	<u>FY06 Original Budget</u>	<u>FY06 Revised Budget</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Revenue	\$257,579,764	\$247,490,143	(\$10,089,531)
Expenditures & Transfers	(\$257,579,764)	(\$258,186,944)	(\$ 607,180)
Total	\$ 0	(\$ 10,696,801)	(\$10,696,801)

Fall tuition of revenue was actually \$63.5 million compared to a budget of \$67.3 million for a shortfall of (\$3.8M). Spring has an additional shortfall projected of \$6.3 million.

1. The shortfall is a result of under-attainment of our enrollment targets. Our budget was built on an addition of 800 students but we were slightly below. Our goal was to restore enrollment to the fall 2004 level.

2. In addition, we have a re-projection by institutional research of spring retention which is contributing an additional \$2 million to our revenue shortfall.
3. The third factor in our shortfall is the plateau pricing effect. We have a significant increase in the number of full-time students taking 13-16 credit hours for which they don't pay any additional tuition. Several years ago we attempted to make an adjustment to our tuition pricing to address this, only to have the Ohio Board of Regents rule it was not in compliance with price controls and fee caps in place.

FY06 Expenditure Problems

Under funded Scholarships	\$1,450,000
Reallocations	(\$ 850,000)
Net Scholarships	\$ 600,000

Utilities (both general and auxiliary) are expected to be over budget by \$2.1M – will be covered by utility contingency and one-time dollars in FY06.

FY06 Recommended Strategy

- Spend Need Based Aid in current year - Eliminate dollars sent to quasi-endowment - \$2.2M
- Health Care Savings - \$2M
- Pharmacy Savings - \$500,000 (includes on-campus pharmacy)
- Increase Auxiliary Overhead Rate from 8.5 to 11% -\$760,000
- Permanent Budget Reduction target - \$4.6M
- Miscellaneous - \$100,000

(Cover utility shortfall with one-time dollars)

Total Reductions = \$10.2M

End year with \$500,000 Deficit

FY06 and FY07 Projected Budgets

	FY06 Revised Pre- <u>Implementation</u>	FY06 Revised Post <u>Implementation</u>	<u>FY07</u>
Revenue	\$247,490,143	\$247,490,143	\$255,534,154
Expenditures & Transfers	(\$258,186,944)	(\$247,990,143)	(\$263,981,456)
Total	<u>\$ 10,696,801</u>	<u>(\$ 500,000)</u>	<u>(\$ 8,447,302)</u>

FY07 Budget Situation

Revenue Assumptions:

- Flat enrollment. This is a major issue to be taken up by Enrollment Services, the Executive Enrollment Management Council, and the Fiscal Advisory Committee. There are many efforts underway to increase enrollment and those analysis and projections will be coming to the FAC where I am sure, they will be debated and ultimately recommendations made on enrollment. We have reason to believe in an enrollment growth that will help close that \$8 million gap.

- 6% fee cap. The budget passed by the Ohio legislature includes a 6% fee cap next year. We are assuming that both the general and instructional fee will be raised by that 6% limit.
- 2% reduction in State Share of Instruction. This is actually an improvement from earlier projections. We received information from OBOR last month that as a result of the lack of state-wide enrollment growth, rather than a 3% reduction, based on our earnings we are looking at a 1.8% reduction.

Expenditures Assumptions:

- Salary increases as per contractual agreements
- Utility increases 10% (5% water) - \$631,000 (Currently negotiating extension of current contract with First Energy)
- Merit Scholarships – same program as FY06 - \$5M The continuation of the merit scholarship program is a critical component of our strategy to improve recruitment of direct from high school students and out of state students.
- Health Care - \$1.4M increase (10% underlying inflation rate)
- Disease Management Program - \$200,000
- Employee Assistance Program - \$26,000
- Islamic Studies Program - \$46,000
- Faculty Hiring Plan - \$874,000 The President has directed us to restore the Faculty Hiring Plan after receiving a recommendation from FAC to suspend it in 2007.
- Minority Assist. Faculty Hiring Plan - \$131,000
- Educational Fringe increase – \$172,000
- Marketing Operations - \$250,000
- Faculty Start-up Funds - \$250,000 (Related to the Faculty Hiring Plan and the growth of UT's research program.)
- Insurance increases – \$66,000 (10%)

FY07 Recommended Strategy

- Apply overhead rate to Designated funds (6%) - \$854,000 Designated funds includes a number of special fees such as laboratory fees, technology fees, and student fees that are targeted for specific purposes. Also included are student activities supported by the general fee and exec MBA program indirect costs. The proposal from the FAC is to target indirect costs just as we do restricted funds, and charge it as funds are expended out of the designated funds. Those funds would come into the general fund and help us to balance the general fund.
- Divest Seagate Center – up to \$290,000
- Suspend initiatives - \$631,000 (Earlier FAC recommendation for minority assistance, marketing operating dollars and faculty start-up funds)
- Reduce non-union employee compensation increases from 3% to 2% - \$550,000
- Reduce Faculty Administrators salary increases (except Chairs) from 5% to 2% - \$250,000. Chairs would remain at the same rate that faculty members are receiving in their contract.
- Reduction Target - \$5.2M for further possible budget cuts in 2007.
- Miscellaneous - \$238,000

- Potential “bridging” strategies to FY08 and FY09

Total Reductions = \$8M
End Year with \$500,000 Deficit

I remind you that this is early and we will not be finalizing fiscal year 2007 budget recommendations until April, maybe even May. We will be tracking our enrollment information very carefully before we make the final decisions on the revenue recommendation for fiscal year '07. We already have begun talking about bridging strategies. If we can contain costs in fiscal year 2008, and we expect revenue growth in fiscal year '08, the strategy would be to spread out that \$5.2 Million reduction target over several years allowing the revenue to grow to close the budget gap rather than having to deeply cut budgets. The key to making this strategy work is to have growth in our revenues in '08 and '09 and constraining the rate of expenditure growth.

FY07 Enrollment Projection Process

1. Institutional Research will provide input from statistical projection model
2. Demographics committee reviews and adjusts if necessary (currently in progress)
3. Fiscal Advisory Committee reviews and recommends what enrollment assumptions should be used for financial planning

FY06 & FY07 After Implementing Strategies

	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>
		<u>Revised</u>	<u>Revised</u>
Revenue	\$247,490,143	\$247,490,143	\$255,534,154
Expenditures & Transfers	(\$258,186,944)	(\$247,990,143)	(\$256,034,154)
Total	<u>\$ 10,696,801</u>	<u>(\$ 500,000)</u>	<u>(\$ 500,000)</u>

Questions/Comments

Senator Thompson-Casado: You talk about the re-projection of spring retention. What does that mean?

Mr. Decatur: When the projections were made for spring, they were run off data that was two years prior. The statistical models used each year by Institutional Research to project forward, introduced an additional error. That was not caught in budget planning last year and the result was higher levels of retention being projected for spring semester than historically is supported.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So historically, all retention is at a much lower percent? We were looking at about \$4 million.

Mr. Decatur: It is about \$2 million.

Sr. Vice Provost Robert Sheehan: I don't think retention is perhaps the right word. Basically what we intend to do is look at spring as a derivative of percentage of fall. There may be new students that come in spring and we may have students who graduate in the fall. So instead of predicting that the spring class will be 96% overall the size of the fall class, historically it makes more sense to predict it at 93%. It is not a retention figure in the terms I think you are interpreting it at. So Bill is correct, if we have a 3 year absolute historical understanding we decided to go with that instead of a statistical model that had perimeters that had estimates that seemed to be incorrect.

Mr. Decatur: If I can anticipate a question, I have been asked this many times why the University went with a budget with a projection of 800 additional students. There was much debate about that. The reality was, if we had not, we would have been cutting more deeply last spring. We looked at the enrollment in 2004 and weighed the cutting of budgets more deeply last spring vs. continuing initiatives like the faculty hiring plan. A clear decision was made by the President that we were not going to back away from the initiatives, so we asked; do we cut now or see what enrollment is and cut later. With the addition of more recruiters and additional scholarship program initiatives we had confidence that enrollment would come back; it did not. Those programs are continuing, so we do have some optimism for next fall.

Chair Jorgensen: You are budgeting for a zero growth?

Mr. Decatur: These scenarios assume no enrollment growth at all.

Senator Barden: These retirement incentives, contracts, run through the entire fiscal years we have been discussing, yet do not show up in your presentation. How does that come into fashion?

Mr. Decatur: When I mentioned that bridging strategy in 2008-09, that faculty incentive retirement program could certainly come into play. There could be base budget savings that could apply to the shortfall we are projecting right now and help close that gap without further departmental reductions.

Chair Jorgensen: That could help save 2007 but not '06.

Mr. Decatur: That is correct. With no further questions, I would like to thank you very much for this opportunity to discuss the budget.

Chair Jorgensen: I would like to introduce a guest who was able to join us a few moments ago to hear President Johnson's comments, Dr. Larry Elmer, MD, PhD, a professor of neurology at The Medical University of Ohio and Chair of their Faculty Senate. I had invited him to attend our meeting today and in turn, he has invited me to attend a future meeting of the MUO faculty. Welcome.

V. Calendar Questions: None

VI. Other Business:

Old Business: Consideration of University Prioritization Plan and Timeline.

UPC Co-chairs, Dr. Jamie Barlowe, Dr. Michael Dowd and Dr. Nagi Naganathan,

Chair Jorgensen: Our next topic is the University Prioritization. We have two of the co-chairs with us today who will be discussing the UPC plan and timeline. This information was distributed to you earlier this week for consideration.

UPC Plan and Timeline

Dr. Michael Dowd, UPC co-chair: Before we begin I would like to say that Jamie Barlowe is unable to make the meeting today. Our presentation will be provided by Professor Walt Olson, Co-chair of the Gamma Committee of the University Prioritization Committee. Walt will be giving a brief PowerPoint presentation on the Baldrige method. We are asking for two things from the Faculty Senate today, endorsement of the method

and endorsement of a timeline. We will discuss the method after the presentation. The timeline is a separate issue we can discuss after that.

Senator Olson: Good afternoon. I know many of you are wondering what this Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for education that is being batted around by a lot of people. You have heard a lot of information, and a lot of misinformation. Hopefully, in a very short period of about 10 minutes, I will be able to clarify some of your questions.

The Baldrige National Quality Program document is free and available to each and every one of you. The web site to download this document is <http://www.quality.nist.gov/>. The term “organization”, as used in the Education Criteria, refers to the unit being assessed. This afternoon I am going to talk about the implication criteria, what is it, how you can get it and how is it organized? Then I would like to talk about a proposal information process. Their criteria as it stands, does not really give you an implementation process, I am superimposing this in-process on that. And lastly, I will talk about the timeline.

What are the criteria?

The criteria is designed to help organizations (units) and universities use an integrated approach to improve organizational performance practices that results in

- delivery of ever-improving value to students and stakeholders, contributing to education quality.
- improvement of overall organizational effectiveness and capabilities. This means to make the organization perform better with less.
- Organizational and personal learning. You will advance beyond this process, it is not the end-all.

Criteria for performance excellence.

The Baldrige method provides

- an assessment tool.
- an integrated framework for assessment
- should be updated yearly by all organizations (units)

Organizational Profile

The Organizational Profile is the first step providing a snapshot of your organization (unit), the key influences on how you operate, and the key challenges you face. Simple questions how do you do what you do? Based upon that foundation, you look at:

1. How Leadership performs
2. How you perform Strategic Planning
3. How do you focus on your Student, Stakeholder and Market
4. How do you Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management
5. How do you focus on your Faculty and Staff
6. What Process Management do you have in place to implement this
7. Organizational Performance Results – How much are you achieving

A Natural Process Develops

This becomes a natural process defined by you consisting of:

- Defining what you are – Do the Organization Profile

- Define how you do it – Answer Categories 1-6
- Define how well you do it – Answer Category 7
- Perform Evaluation and Set Priorities

You see a natural logic here. This natural logic is the logic that I impose on to the timeline to get in process.

Timeline –with regular updates to Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and Administrators.

Time	Review Unit	CPC/CPNAP/NCAPP	UPC Subcommittees	UPC
Interval 0	National Speaker to Educate Various Constituencies			
Interval 1	Units begin Organization Profile	Issue instructions to units	Issue instructions to units	Monitor Process and
Interval 2	Purpose: Defines "what" 5 Pages max	Review Organization Profiles for omissions &	Monitor Process and Answer Questions	Progress, and Answer Questions
Interval 3	Modify in response to CPC comments	inconsistencies		
Interval 4	Selected Units Answer Categories 1-6	Prepare the subgroup Organization Profile		
Interval 5	Purpose: Define "how" [BC 2-6; pp. 15-30]	Review Selected Subgroups Categories 1-6	for omission & inconsistencies	Prepare the Organization Profile for each group
Interval 6	Modify in response to CPC comments	Answers for omission & inconsistencies	Prepare the Organization Profile for each group	
Interval 7	Selected Units Answer Category 7: Results	Answer for Categories 1-6 at subgroup level	Review Selected Subgroups Categories 1-6 Answers for	Prepare the University
Interval 8	Purpose: define "how well" [BC 7; pp 31-34]	Review Selected Units' Answers for Category 7	omission & inconsistencies	Organization Profile
Interval 9	Modify in response to CPC comments	for omission & inconsistencies	Prepare report for each group	Answer Categories
Interval 10	Evaluate and set internal priorities	Answer Category 7 for Selected Subgroups	Review Selected Subgroups Category 7 Answers for	1-6 at the University
Interval 11	Modify in response to CPC comments and plan for next cycle	Evaluate and set internal priorities	omission & inconsistencies	level
Interval 12		Modify in response to CPC and unit response	Prepare report for each group	Answer Categories
Interval 13		and plan for next cycle	Evaluate subgroup recommendations	7 at the University
Interval 14			and prepare recommendations	Level
Interval 15			for group priorities	Modify
Interval 16				recommendations in response to comments, set priorities, and plan for next cycle
Interval 18				

The above timetable indicates the proposed sequence of events for the proposed process. Note the designated start of selected units for particular phases of this process. That is, while all units will begin the first phase of this process at the same time, the starting date of subsequent phases for selected units will follow in staggered assignments (determined by the UPC) UPC - Co-Chairs: Nov. 15, 2005

You will notice a progression of activities. Going down is time, across are the different organizations working at different levels, with reviewable units at the base level.

Typically this is a department or it maybe a program. The next level is the college with the various committees. Above that is the UPC looking at it with constant feedback to this organization, Graduate Council and the Administrators.

In summary, I talked about the educational directory; I told you what they were, why they exist, than told you about the proposed process. I have been asked to also present the motion at the end of my presentation

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate endorse the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Program method as our method for prioritization and that we move forward with that and I so move it, do I have a second. Seconded.

Discussion on the motion

Senator Bowyer: It is my understanding of Baldrige, that the upper administration of the institution or company prioritizes or sets goals. They say what is going to move on, what is the most important thing we do, the second, the third, etc. In talking with the Baldrige examiner who wrote a criteria for the College of Business if you can't do that; basically you are done. You must be able to do that. My question is who is telling us that?

Senator Olson: When a firm initially starts the process they don't have those answers. If we are very confident in our results, we would want to invite an examiner here and could be prepared to answer that from our evaluation and prioritization process.

Senator Bowyer: That is not what I meant. From a Baldrige standpoint, you have got to be able to evaluate yourself relative to some set of standards. Since everybody has different sets of standards, we have the same problem we had before.

Dr. Nagi Naganathan, UPC Co-Chair: One way to look at this is to look at the process itself. Walt presented the second step wherein we saw the reference to the strategic plan. When each unit goes through the process, if the unit has done its part right, there would be a strategic plan in place within which the unit's priorities are well articulated. At the institutional level we have done the same thing through the University-wide strategic plan.

UPC Co-Chair Mike Dowd: We raised the same questions with the central administration but they have not yet provided such particular goals. That is something they will have to address.

Senator Lipman: I was asked to read some comments from Senator Martin Ritchie, who could not be here today due to illness. He has studied the Baldrige Plan and is a representative of the Graduate Council and Faculty Senate who has solicited feedback from members of his college (HHS) and would like to have their concerns heard.

1. It is unclear to several of my colleagues exactly how the Baldrige model will be used in prioritization since the purpose of the model is not prioritization.
2. One of the reasons for changing course from the UPC's original prioritization plan was the realization that the person hours needed to complete the task were unreasonable. I do not believe the Baldrige plan addresses these concerns. What current responsibilities and activities will faculty and staff give up to devote time to such a massive undertaking and at what cost to productivity and/or career advancement?
3. Many units within the University already undergo accreditations or approval processed from external bodies. Preparing the Baldrige evaluation would come on

top of the time required to prepare reports for the other accrediting bodies even if some of the information was used in more than one report.

4. The proposed timeline suggests that by the time all of the units complete their evaluations, there will be differences of several years.
5. A final concern expressed to me was questioning the entire notion of comparing academic and non-academic units. It is unclear how this proposal would be used to compare and prioritize various units across the university.

Senator Olson: The Baldrige method is not meant to compare units against units. The purpose is to insure units understand what they are doing and how they can improve. Prioritization is different; it really is determining where you want to go then going in that direction. Baldrige ensures you know that and can get there.

The question about time, these are questions that you should be asking yourself during the normal course of your work as it exists. The first time you do work, it will take more time because perhaps you haven't done this before; but you should be doing it. Many accrediting agents require that you do this process. They might not call it the Baldrige process but ABET, our Engineering method, is the Baldrige process and I have heard that is true from the Business College too. If you go to the North Central University process, you will see they directly reference this- they want you to use this process.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: Senator Ritchie has brought up some very important points, such as the cost to the University in the number of hours that will have to be devoted to this activity. But when we talk about costs we also have to talk about benefits. Is there a benefit to doing this? If you examine the documents the Executive Committee emailed to Senators, there are very clear benefits. Even though costs can be significant, there are definite benefits to both the academic side and the non-academic side of the university. This has to be taken into account.

Senator Fournier: I was just wondering how you close the loop on what appears to be a continuous improvement process.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: What will happen is the review process will begin at the department or program level. It will then go to the college level. Then after a particular college's departments complete the process, that college could reallocate resources within their own college based on its own analysis. After the entire process for all the colleges and non-academic units have been completed, we will have a macro view of this process and responses and then could perhaps prioritize at a university level. Prioritization can occur much sooner at a college level than at the university-wide level.

UPC Co-Chair Naganathan: As priorities evolve from the various units and as we participate in the university-wide decisions, we get to make informed decisions about ourselves.

Senator Fournier: That is just my point. Right now we have a process to make \$10 million a year adjustments coming in part from information on prioritization. Seeing the absence of that information, and then leading into a possible merger and all that entails makes me question this method.

Senator Olson: Wouldn't it be nice to have this information and know what our priorities are?

Senator Barden: I read the entire Baldrige document and I feel it is very good; as it says, its purpose is to improve the organization's effectiveness. Its purpose, however, is for review and assessment, not prioritization. The professional colleges already have

something like this in place for their accreditation but, Arts and Sciences does not. I agree that our college, A&S, will be very well served by adapting this because NCA has been critical of the University of Toledo on our program assessment anyhow. But I must agree though with Senators Fournier and Ritchie that this is simply not a model for prioritization. I went so far as to click the search button on my computer to look for the words priority, prioritize, or prioritization and they were not to be found anywhere in the entire document. It is a continuous improvement method, period. I also think with each of these time intervals representing a month, we are facing an 18 months timetable for the process to conclude. While all of this is going on we are talking about merging with MUO and all sorts of unforeseen issues along with our budget crisis.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: It is true this method is not what we envisioned. But, let's keep our eyes on the ball here. Consider the alternative to that presented today. Do you really want to go back to strict, raw, rank-ordering of programs? The proposed method is different, I acknowledge that, but we think it is better in terms of long term benefits.

Regarding the other issues about the possible merger, although I have some concerns about the timeline that the UPC has approved, I would like to separate the issues. Can we have the endorsement of the proposed method from Faculty Senate and later Graduate Council, independent of the timeline? If the timeline issue is dealt with separately, and the merger does not occur then this timeline does not need to be revised. If the merger does occur, we will most likely have to go back to the UPC and revise the timeline.

The last point about the interims specified in the timelines. They were initially months but we deliberately changed it to something nondescript because there are issues that need to be worked out, such as whether faculty working during the summer months and whether stipends would be provided.

Chair Jorgensen: Let me clarify; does the motion include the timeline?

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: No, it does not.

Senator King: As I understand the motion, the units which are at the bottom, are going to start out by studying at the presidential level on down. Is that correct?

Senator Olson: There is a mistake in concept there. When we speak of units in leadership, and studying units of leadership, the colleges will assess the college leadership, the UPC would assess the campus leadership and the Vice Presidents studies the leadership at the top levels of the university. So when you say your leadership at the department level, you would really be talking about your administrators in your department.

Senator King: I still have not figured out where the prioritization method comes in since so far we have the self-study method.

Senator Olson: The prioritization study goes from the evaluation of what you did previously. At this time, now that you understand what it is you are and how you do it, you are able to set goals for the future. That goal-setting is where the priorities evolve.

Senator King: You are saying the units need to have the right goals if they want to come back well in the prioritization.

Senator Niamat: Is it possible for the UPC to give a copy of the interim report on prioritization to the Faculty Senators so they can see what tasks the UPC has accomplished to date and thus better appreciate the problems it is encountering with the old model?

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: Currently we do not have an interim report as we no longer have secretarial support. Our report was the presentation just provided by Vice Chair Olson.

Senator Lundquist: It seems to me that there is a benefit to this process in the future, but again I turn to the cost. It looks like a very big job. Now, if you have a small department and want to do a good job, it is going to take some time and person hours. I know my days are filled up as well as a lot of my colleagues. I think practically speaking that issue has not been addressed. Where are we going to find the hours in the day to do this?

UPC Co-Chair Naganathan: In the College of Engineering, our accreditations were based on a completely different model. In 1993 I remember going through our first process. I hardly knew then that there was an accreditation process in place. My chair came to me and asked if I could do something and I completed a couple of things for him. It was mostly an administrative leadership reviews. In 1999 we chose to adopt a new method that was a self-examination method. We adopted an outcomes-based method. That was the first time faculty were extensively involved in the process. Was it difficult the first time? It was. There were a lot of reluctant participants; but we chose to do it. We just went through this process again in 2005, and because we did this in 1999, I can assure you the whole process went much better. There was a lot of faculty involvement because once we become involved in a process like Baldrige, it becomes a part of our culture and now is just the way we do business.

Senator Olson: When the College of Engineering went through this process, whole groups of faculty were working and learning about all of the classes that were being taught. Questions were asked like; what is being taught in that course and how will it fit with my course? We had a lot of group interaction that really improved our program overall. Was there some time lost, yes, but what we got out of this process was so powerful it was completely worth that time.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: The costs will be significant, and will not just be faculty time but also costs in terms of secretarial time and effort as well. Let's not overlook or minimize these costs. Everyone must recognize that opportunity costs associated with this activity will be significant.

Senator Stoudt: Walt, I just heard you say something about the process that your college, the College of Engineering, is engaged in. You said what you got out of it made it all worthwhile. I think that if we all knew what we might get out of this process, we might all jump on board; but we don't. You said this was a good model and that people know where they are going and how to get there using it. We all know that we *don't* know where we are going. We all know what we want to do. We know what we currently do, the nature of our endeavors, and the quality of them. What we don't know is where this administration wants us to be going because we don't have a clear vision.

We do not even know if we are going to be merged with another institution six months from now or not. We don't know what our budget situation is. It seems that to invest resources in something whose outcome is so vague is problematic. I am not convinced that the Baldrige method is the appropriate model. Is it better than what we have now? Apparently so, but why is its use just being suggested now? We still need a vision for this institution; that is lacking in everything we do, which creates problems with the budget and other areas as well. In addition to that, since not even the UPC has secretarial support, where are the units supposed to get their support for this process?

This seems to me as a process that generates more reports. I would like to know what the difference is between a process like Baldrige and Program Review? In the past Program Review was used in departments or units to help them take a look at themselves and examine what they were doing.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: May I ask Senator Patsy Komuniecki to answer that question as I believe she was involved in that round of program review and therefore knows far more about that process than I do.

Senator Komuniecki: I was involved in program review for many years as an Associate Dean. I thought it was a fabulous process that was well informed. It consisted of inside people doing self studies in their departments who then prepared a document. That document was reviewed by a person outside that department on this campus who had some sense about the general discipline. It then went up to a higher level review at APAC which would make recommendations that could be implemented at the college level. I thought it was a great process.

Senator Olson: That is very consistent with Baldrige.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: For the other part of Senator Stoudt's question, I would like to ask Mr. Decatur to speak on the benefits of employing a Baldrige type system of continuous improvement for the non-academic units.

Mr. Decatur: First, for the support operations this is a natural. It focuses on the service provided by support operations, how we do it, the processes, how we improve those processes measuring both our output and the satisfaction from our clients from the work and service we provide.

In light of the merger, if you look at the overlap between UT and MUO, the academic overlap is limited while the overlap in finance, technology and operations is total. So when the Regents and legislators talk about eliminating duplication, in this proposed merger, the focus for improvement efforts, elimination of duplication, and improvement of processes, they are going to be focused very strongly on support operations. This Baldrige method, which my division enthusiastically supports, I see as a very important means of working through the challenges presented by this merger. Those steps involved in learning how you do something and proving those processes, is part-in-parcel in the process of reengineering. In fact, we probably will be expanding on that and in many cases undertaking a full-blown process reengineering. How we work certain support operations into one unit that serves a larger organization will be served very well by the process proposed to you. In fact, I can not think of a better process while keeping an eye on the larger institutional needs and perspectives while focusing at the same time, on the specific services provided by support operations.

Senator Martin: It seems to me the process that you've described would better be described as quality or efficiency rather than prioritization. Since the College of Engineering has been through this, I wonder, Nagi or Walt, has it prioritized anything? Has it allowed you to do any differentiation?

Co-Chair Naganathan: I think we have in terms of department duplications. We are looking at program level decisions right now. Even after you go through an accreditation process and do well, you still ask certain questions. It is just something you continue to do.

Senator Bowyer: I look at a university as doing four things; undergraduate education, graduate education, research grants and community outreach. I try very hard to say can

someone number them for me? What is first, second, third, or fourth? The answer - we want to do all of them great - is not an answer because it is not realistic. I think before you can do this proposed process, the individual units need to have from the upper administration of this university, what I believe Senator Stoudt questioned, a very clear vision of what is number one, two, etc. That does not mean you don't do number four, but I can't vote for this without having those kind of priorities set.

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: If we had those four priorities, would you have any problem with this process?

Senator Bowyer: No

UPC Co-Chair Dowd: I agree we need to get direction and set goals, goals determined or stated by the President. If we get that would you approve of this method?

Senator Bowyer: But I haven't seen that yet. I don't like to vote for something with the assumption that I am going to see something and halfway through it and still don't have those goals.

Senator Skeens: Call the question.

Chair Jorgensen: To call on a debatable motion you need a 2/3 majority just to decide to vote. Those who wish to end debate and vote at the present time please say aye. Opposed nay. (voice vote undeterminable)

Senator Lipman: Call for a hand vote

Chair Jorgensen: Those in favor show of hands- 28 Opposed- 10

Approved by a show of hands.

We move immediately to the vote to approve Senator Olson's previous motion: That the Faculty Senate endorse the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Program method as our method for prioritization and that we move forward with that. (voice vote undeterminable)

We will move to a hand vote. In favor show of hands-16 Opposed- 20

Motion to endorse the Baldrige method defeated by show of hands.

Old Business: I would like to introduce our newly elected Senator, Professor Mesbuh Ahmed, from The College of Business, who has agreed to fulfill the last year of a term.

New Business: Consideration of Resolution on UT/MUO merger

Chair Jorgensen: Under new business is a resolution that was distributed to you prior to today's meeting. I will ask Senator Floyd our archivist to make a motion from the Executive Committee, so it needs no approval, and we will then hold a debate on the resolution.

Senator Floyd: Before I introduce the resolution of the Executive Committee regarding the proposed merger, however, Chair Jorgensen asked me to take a minute to recount how the history of our two institutions have been intertwined from the beginning, a fact that many may not be aware of.

In the early 1960s, a commission established by then governor Michael DiSalle began studying the need to establish additional medical colleges in Ohio in order to supply badly needed physicians. Early on, Toledo was mentioned as a possible site for one of these new universities, and more specifically, a consultant brought in to study the issue recommended that the University of Toledo be considered as the site for the new college. A panel of physicians chosen by the governor's office concurred that a new Toledo medical college should be built on the UT campus, and President William

Carlson, working with Toledo Area Medical College and Education Foundation, hired an architect to design the proposed medical college complex. It was to be built where our law school is located today. However, in 1964 when the Ohio Board of Regents formally recommended Toledo as a site for a new state medical school, they indicated the college was to be a separate institution. The reason provided by the Regents was that UT was, at that time, still a municipal university supported by the city of Toledo taxpayers, and they feared that if they provided state funding to the University of Toledo for a medical college, the other municipal institutions in Ohio—Akron and Cincinnati—would want similar direct state aid. So in November 1964, when the legislature approved of what was then called the Toledo State College of Medicine, it did so as a stand-alone medical college.

With this historical background, hopefully you will see that discussion of a merger between the two institutions is in many ways returning us to where we, and MUO, began forty years ago.

Resolution of support for the possible merger of the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio reads as follows:

WHEREAS the presidents of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio have begun talks concerning a merger of the two institutions:

AND WHEREAS an analysis of the merger commissioned by the board of trustees of the Medical University of Ohio outlined the many positive outcomes of such a merger for both institutions;

AND WHEREAS these positives included: improved prestige, improved political positioning, better public perception, enhanced fundraising capability, and increased state appropriations;

AND WHEREAS a merger would present the possibility for enhanced research funding and collaboration between existing research departments;

AND WHEREAS the merger of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio would produce the third largest public university in Ohio;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of The University of Toledo supports the move toward merging the two institutions;

AND, in the longstanding tradition of shared governance, the UT Faculty Senate looks forward to partnering with the administrations of both universities as the merger discussions proceed.

Chair Jorgensen: I open the floor to debate

Senator Thompson-Casado: I am not against this, but I am against the fact that this is being placed before us at the last few minutes of the meeting, whereas they (MUO & UT presidents) have had four years of discussion on this topic. The information I have comes

from the local newspaper. I was not aware that there was a study done between the two universities. If my vote is being sought, I want to have an informed vote. I don't want to be voting on something that I thought about in ten minutes. There has been no discussion on the disadvantages, we have heard only brief estimates of costs, not to mention the timing of the merger with so many uncertainties. I don't expect all the questions to be answered at this point but I do want more information before voting on something so serious. I don't want to do this at the last minute.

Senator Fournier: I was wondering structurally about the costs given.

Chair Jorgensen: That was a quote from the report probably, I think it is based on budget, not on enrollment. The financial number is \$650,000,000 combined. They have about 2,000 students, 500 of which are also UT students.

Senator Stoudt: I would like to support what my colleague said with regard to the timing and the lack of information. I also was struck by parts of the resolution as well as some of the President's comments, which - no offense intended - were simply platitudes. We heard the phrase "a move to greatness," we heard that his merger will improve our political situation and enhance our opportunities and allow for all kinds of wonderful things, but I have not seen any specifics. Perhaps these are in the report that none of us have seen.

The President talked about the legislature being the body to make the final decision. If the legislature thought this was such a great idea, why didn't they take the initiative? Why does this have to be done now? We are told, this is the time, if we lose it, we will lose the opportunity. If the legislature thought this was such an opportune time, wouldn't one have thought they would have been part of the conversation? I would be interested to hear if anyone can speak to that.

Chair Jorgensen: The President had an extensive discussion with the Senate Exec. Committee last Thursday, Nov. 17, and the legislature has been involved in the process, the Ohio Board of Regents has been involved, and have been very supportive. Even though the legislature will actually decide, it will come up through the ranks. Last Thursday was the first time Faculty Senate was involved with this issue.

Senator Stoudt: Who does the proposal come from then and where does it go?

Chair Jorgensen: If the Boards of Trustees decided to move forward, they would send the proposal to the Ohio Board of Regents, then to the legislature and finally to the governor.

Senator Hoover: **This may be an excellent idea. The way this idea was presented to us was certainly very favorable. However, there were no effort to address the difficulties or the downside of this issue and given the timing of all of this; I move that this resolution be tabled.**

Motion was seconded.

Chair Jorgensen: Those in favor of tabling the resolution please raise their hands.

In Favor: 25 Opposed: 10

Motion to approve the resolution supporting the UT/MUO merger tabled

Senator Bowyer: Is there anyway we can get a PDF copy of the merger study?

Chair Jorgensen: The Faculty Senate Office has hard copies of the merger study and you can pick up a copy from that office. I do not have or know of a PDF file. MCO did commission this study, but it is a public report.

Senator Barden: Could you convey to the administration, at least from my personal perspective, as an at-large faculty senator, that this should not to be taken as a negative vote on the merger concept.

Chair Jorgensen: When do you want to discuss this? As it turns out the Board could be voting on this issue as soon as December. We do have a meeting in two weeks which will primarily be addressing the admissions criteria, but we will have 30 minutes to discuss this at the beginning of the meeting. Anyone can move to take it off of the table at that time.

VII. Adjournment: Chair Jorgensen adjourned the meeting at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven J. Martin
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Betsy Welsh
Office Admin. Secretary